

REMARKS

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended the drawings as shown in red-ink on the attached drawings sheets. Specifically, Figures 3(A), 4 and 5 have been identified as prior art. New Figure 3(B) shows the rotational speed controller with the low pass filters of the present invention, namely PDT2 and Cauer filter. Upon review of all of the drawings, the references used to identify the various elements are clearly described in the Specification. Further, Applicants have amended the Specification at paragraphs [0014] and [0015] to reflect the aforementioned drawings changes. By these amendments, no new matter has been introduced into the Specification.

Applicants have also amended Claim 1 in order to limit the low pass filter element to those included within the scope of the Markush group, i.e. PDT2 and Cauer filters. Claims 2 and 4 have been deleted. Claims 3, 5 and 7 have been amended so as to depend from claim 1. Finally, claims 10-13 have been amended pursuant to the Examiner's suggestion in item No. 3 on page 2 of the Official Action. Accordingly, the objections to the drawings, and the rejection of claims 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,355,060 (Peterson) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,404,418 (Nagano) as argued for in item No. 5 on pages 3 and 4 of the Official Action are believed to be moot.


Further, the Examiner has similarly rejected (35 U.S.C. §103(a)) claims 1-13 over U.S. Patent No. 5,712,546 (Tsutsumishita) in view of Nagano. The arguments in support of this rejection are set forth in paragraph 7 on pages 4 and 5 of the Official Action.

The foregoing, notwithstanding, Applicants respectfully traverse all outstanding grounds for rejection. The claims as now amended recite specifically a Markush group of low pass filters, i.e. PDT2 and Cauer filters that have been found to provided unexpected and superior results over previously known and used low pass filters, i.e. PT1 and PT2. Figure 6 illustrates the improvement achieved by the low pass filters having the PDT2 element and Cauer filter over known low pass filters with a PT2 element. See page 8 of the Specification.

Applicants have carefully considered each of the cited prior art references and find no disclosure of the use of a PDT2 element in a low pass filter or any disclosure of the use of a Cauer filter to effect a suppression in resonances in a controlled system. Accordingly, it is Applicants' position that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to select the claimed filter element or Cauer filter on the strength of the teaching of the prior art in order to realize the improvement unexpectedly realized by their use over low pass filters previously used and disclosed to effect suppression in resonances in a rotational speed control.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the foregoing amendment and remarks.

Respectfully submitted,



Bradley B. Geist

Patent Office Reg. No. 27,551

Attorney for Applicants
(212) 408-2562